



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,949	01/11/2001	Robert C. Frisch	0102323-00061	9640
21125 75	90 06/04/2004		EXAM	INER
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP			NGUYEN, BRIAN D	
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			2661	6
		1	DATE MAILED: 06/04/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·					
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/758,949	FRISCH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brian D Nguyen	2661			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif of the period for reply secified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ply within the statutory minimum of thirty I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB.	reply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11</u> . 2a)□ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	January 2001. is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 11-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the	cepted or b)□ objected to t				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Aporty documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5</u>. 		/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 5, "the message" seems to refer back to "a message packet" in line 3. If this is true, it is suggested to change "the message" to ---the message packet---. In line 6, "relation in to a frame signal" seems to mean "relation to a frame signal". If this is true, it is suggested to change "relation in to a frame signal" to ---relation to a frame signal---.

Claim 7, line 1, "a link" seems to refer back to "at least one link" in line 2 of claim 1. If this is true, it is suggested to change "a link" to ---the link---. "a first node" in line 2 seems to refer back to "a first node" in line 4 of claim 1. If this is true, it is suggested to change "a first node" to ---the first node---

Claim 8, line 1, "an adjacent node" seems to refer back to "an adjacent node" in line 10 of claim 1. If this is true, it is suggested to change "an adjacent node" to ---the adjacent node---.

Claim 11, lines 5-6, "relation in to a frame signal" seems to mean "relation to a frame signal". If this is true, it is suggested to change "relation in to a frame signal" to ---relation to a frame signal---. In line 8, it is suggested to replace "a the" with ---the---.

Claim 16, lines 5-6, "relation in to a word boundaries" seems to mean "relation to word boundaries". If this is true, it is suggested to change "relation in to word boundaries" to --- relation to word boundaries---.

Claim 19, line 2, it is suggested to change "a adjacent receiving node" to ---an adjacent receiving node---

Art Unit: 2661

Claim 21, line 2, "adjacent first and a second nodes" should be changed to ---adjacent first and second nodes---.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 11-15, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "said receiving node" in line 10; "the first receiving node" and "the transmitting node" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "said output buffer" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the adjacent receiving node" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2661

5. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padovani et al (6,574,211) in view of Yeung et al (6,438,13).

Regarding claims 16-19, Padovani discloses a system comprising a plurality of nodes, the two adjacent nodes are communicating to one another over a link and the transmission rate is adjustable the meet the network condition (see abstract; col. 7, lines 1-6; col. 29, lines 52-62). Padovani does not specifically disclose aligning the message packet. However, aligning the message packet is well known in the art. Yeung discloses this limitation (see col. 8, line 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to aligning the message packet in relation to word boundaries as taught by Yeung in the system of Padovani in order to meet specific needs.

6. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Keen (5,664,091) in view of Arimilli et al (6,671,712).

Regarding claims 21-23, Keen discloses a system that comprises a first node and a second node. Data and control information is transmitted between the first and second node and retransmitting data packet if the packet is not received at the receiving node (see abstract; col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 6). Keen does not specifically disclose STOMP symbol. However, the STOMP symbol is well known in the art. Arimilli discloses use the STOMP symbol to cancel an interrupted packet (see col. 3, line 39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the STOMP symbol to cancel the interrupted packet as taught by Yeung in the system of Keen in order to eliminate unusable packet from the network.

Art Unit: 2661

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-15 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection(s) and/or the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian D Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5133. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian Nguyen

5/29/04